REMARKS

Claims 39, 40 and 41 have been canceled (without prejudice), and claims 50, 51 and 52 have been added. Therefore, claims 18-23, 29-35, 37 and 48-52 are currently pending. Claims 18, 19, 29, 30 and 35 have been amended herein. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration as to the patentability of the pending claims in view of the foregoing amendments and following discussion.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 18-23 and 29-34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thornburg et al. ('Thornburg') (U.S. Patent No. 4,318,096) in view of Sites. ('Sites') (U.S. Patent No. 6,408,092).

Independent claim 18, as previously amended, recites the step of determining "a user-selectable" object display attribute based on said pressure data. The Examiner asserts the argument indicated in parenthesis with respect to the claim recitation indicated below:

> *determining a user-selectable object display attribute based on said pressure data (The examiner notes the pressure ranges in the converter to output are determined/selected in accordance to the user's preference to the line width, hence the line width, the claimed "object display attribute", are user-selectable. e.g. the user selects pressure range 0-50 to be one line width).*

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner is not applying the correct interpretation to element "c" of Claim 18. Element "c" of claim 18 defines modification of the attribute based on application of an amount of pressure that is user selectable. Element "c" of claim 18 does not define that the user selectable aspect is the modification of the attribute itself. Applicants respectfully provide the following quote from the specification to support this interpretation urged by Applicants:

> *[T]he present invention allows the user to utilize pressure on the digitizer to select certain display attributes within the graphics program rather than use the icons 750. This can be applied to any application program that allows character set selection or visual attribute selection, such as the selection between character*

sizes, character fonts, character attributes (italic, bold, superscript, color selection, shadowing, etc.).

Applicants have amended the claim to emphasize this intended interpretation of element "c" of the claim. Applicants respectfully submit that a combination of Thornberg and Sites together does not teach this aspect of the claims, therefore, the combination does not render obvious at the very least this feature of independent claim 18.

Independent claim 29, as previously amended, recites the step of determining "a user-selectable" object display attribute based on "said pressure data." The Examiner makes the same argument with respect to claim 29 as with respect to claim 18. Claim 29 is distinct for the same reasons urged above with respect to claim 18.

The Examiner is respectfully request to withdraw the rejections of independent claims 18 and 29 and their dependent claims 20-23 and 30-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on a combination of the references Thornburg and Sites.

Specifically, Claims 35-38 and 48-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fututsugi et al. ('Fututsugi') (U.S. Patent No. 5,533,141) in view of Wirtz. ('Wirtz') (U.S. Patent No. 5,730,468).

Regarding Claim 35 the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the two pieces of prior art. The Examiner asserts that the references "are combinable because they are in the same field of endeavor, i.e. signature verification system." Applicants respectfully contend that the two references are in fact not in the same field of endeavor. To the contrary, Fututsugi is in the field of endeavor of handwriting recognition (synonymous with penmanship/handwriting interpretation), whereas Writz is in the "signature verification system" field of endeavor. To support this contention, Applicants' respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to the following passage from Fututsugi, which demonstrates Fututsugi's field of endeavor:

According to a second aspect of the present invention, there is provided a processing system with pen pointing device comprising the above-mentioned portable pen pointing device and a processing system body for acquiring information for interpretation of penmanship/handwriting on the basis of the user's specific information supplied from the portable pen pointing device.

Users' handwriting is explicitly not used for verification of the user, but rather simply to strengthen the accuracy of character recognition.

Further, Applicants contend that the verification system in Wirtz differentiates from a significant factor in the present application. It should first be noted that though the present invention is not limited to portable computing devices, it is however, specifically designed with portable computing devices in mind. When considering portable computing platforms, it is important to focus on certain aspects, particularly performance when there are limited resources. The present invention delineates sets of vectors based on when a stylus I is placed on the surface of the tactile device and when it is lifted. The stylus does not collect data when the stylus is not present on the device. This is supported in the present specification by Figures 13A and 13B and in the following text from the specification indicated below:

> *A handwriting recognition process 600 using pressure data, spatial stroke data, a volume 410 and a radial projection is shown in Figure 13A. The process 600 commences when the stylus 80 or pen is detected as touching the digitizer, step 605. During the user-drawn stroke, steps 610, 615 and 620 capture the spatial stroke data and associated pressure data and store this information in memory. This continues until the stylus 80 is detected as no longer making contact with the digitizer, step 625.*

By only collecting data for points where the stylus is present on the surface the memory and processing requirements are greatly reduced from the implementation represented in Wirtz where the pen is continually tracked even when above the surface as is clearly taught by Wirtz (see exemplary text below):

> *This character string represents e.g, a signature and is divided into individual strokes 1 to 11. Here it should be noted that the strokes can be divided into two subclasses: the nearstrokes. i.e. strokes that are not written. and the writing 35 stroke s. i.e., strokes in which the stylus touches the paper or the writing surface.*

This implies that the movement of the stylus when it is not in contact with the surface is classified as a stroke. With the Wirtz technique, accuracy of verification is at the expense of additional hardware constraints.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of independent claim 35 and its dependent claims 36-38 and 48-49 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on a combination of Fututsugi and Wirtz.

New Claims

New claims 50, 51 and 52 depend from amended claims 18, 29 and 35, respectively, and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons urged with respect to the independent claims from which they depend.

Conclusion

Favorable consideration of the claims here is respectfully requested. In the event any issues remain for the Examiner to resolve, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if a telephone or personal interview may expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.

Dated: August 20, 2008

By: /Reena Kuyper/
Reena Kuyper
Registration No. 33,830

Berry & Associates P.C.
9255 Sunset Boulevard, Suite 810
Los Angeles, CA 90069
(310) 247-2860